



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,783	05/24/2001	Indra Laksono	VIXS 006	8015
34280	7590	10/02/2008	EXAMINER	
TIMOTHY W. MARKISON			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
VIXS, INC.				
P.O.BOX 160727			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78736			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/864,783	LAKSONO, INDRA	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	REUBEN M. BROWN	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-74 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-33 & 57-74 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15, & 34-56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 10-14, 42-44, & 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludtke, (U.S. Pat # 6,202,210).

Considering claims 1 & 42, Ludtke teaches a system wherein a receiver 122 , receives a plurality of media signals from a plurality of different sources and provides them as a data stream to a video monitor 121, see Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 21-45; col. 6, lines 36-45. The receiver 122

receives regular broadcast TV programming via STB 125 and locally stored programming via multi-disc player 123, which reads on the claimed local media player.

The amended claimed, '*method for isolating a channel of interest from a set of channels from a plurality of multimedia sources that include a video network in a multimedia system that includes a multimedia server that is coupled to the plurality of multimedia sources*', reads on the disclosure of Ludtke. In particular, the user selects a desired programming from the plurality of sources that are available and the associated programming is delivered to the monitor 121, via the receiver 122.

'*receiving the set of channels as a stream of data*', reads on the disclosure of Ludtke that the receiver 122 transmits broadcast stream to the video monitor 121, col 6, lines 36-45.

'*interpreting segments of the stream of data to identify data of the channel of interest*'; and '*interpreting the data of the channel of interest to determine the type of data*' is also met by the disclosure Ludtke which teaches that the broadcast stream attaches ID tags that identify the segments of the broadcast stream for selection by the user and collection by the passive monitoring system that tracks the ID of programs being displayed on the monitor 121, see col. 6, lines 57-67 thru col. 7, lines 1-15 & col. 8, lines 35-52 & col. 11, lines 17-65.

*'processing the data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce processed data'* and *'providing the processed data for display'* is also met by the operation of the receiver 122 (col. 10, lines 1-35) & monitor 121.

Considering claims 2-3, 12, 43-44 & 53 Ludtke teaches that the receiver may determine the selected programming by parsing the MPEG data and analyzing the assailed Service information, or in an alternate embodiment the program ID (PID) values associated with programs are read, col. 10, lines 36-42. These values read on the claimed header, since the PID value is generally found within the header of a packet, hence the term packet ID or program ID.

Considering claims 10-11 & 51-52, the claimed *'application data'* subject matter is broad enough to read MPEG data which requires buffering and processing before transmission to the monitor 121, col. 8, lines 36-45 & col. 11, lines 51-58.

Considering claims 13 & 54, see Ludtke, col. 11, lines 15-30.

Considering claims 14 & 55, the subject matter is met by Ludtke, col. 6, lines 35-46; col. 11, lines 24-27; col. 11, lines 51-65.

4. Claims 4-5 & 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke, in view of Mills, (U.S. Pat # 6,311,204).

Considering claims 4-5 & 45-46, Ludtke teaches that the received data is processed before being displayed, but does not disclose the feature of converting YUV data and RGB data. Nevertheless Mills, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches a decoder system that receives MPEG video data (col. 9, lines 35-55) and converts RGB data to YUV data, col. 13, lines 30-55. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Ludtke with the feature of converting RGB to YUV data, at least for the purpose of enabling a particular interpolation and blending process, as taught by Mills, col. 2, lines 18-40.

5. Claims 6-7 & 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke & Mills as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Leone, (U.S. Pat # 6,901,153).

Considering claims 6 & 47, Ludtke & Mills do not discuss the claimed feature of ‘Huffman decoding’ or ‘de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data’ and ‘de-quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data’. However, Leone which is in the same field of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which is de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Ludtke with the feature of Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically

teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, ‘performing IDCT upon the de-Q data’ and ‘motion compensation and scaling’, see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Considering claims 7 & 48, Leone teaches converting the YUV to RGB data, see col. 2, lines 50-67.

6. Claims 8-9 & 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke as applied to claims 3 & 44 above, and further in view of Sueyoshi, (U.S. Pat # 6,295,319).

Considering claims 8-9 & 49-50, even though Ludtke teaches determining the type of data, such as audio or video, by looking at the PID, the reference does not discuss converting the audio into PCM. Nevertheless, Sueyoshi teaches converting the audio MPEG data in to PCM and holding in a buffer, see col. 4, lines 55-61; col. 5, lines 6-15 & col. 7, lines 37-67. It would have Hamlin with the feature of converting audio data to PCM as taught by Sueyoshi, for the desirable improvement of a standard audio decoding algorithm that provides and enhanced sound production.

7. Claims 15 & 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludtke, in view of Tsuge, (U.S. Pat # 5,995,709).

Considering claims 15 & 56, even though Ludtke teaches decoding a video stream, the reference does not teach specifics of at least one of: multilevel coding/decoding, non-return-to-zero coding/decoding, block coding/decoding, and nB/m coding/decoding of data streams. However Tsuge, which is in the same field of endeavor, provides a teaching of non-return to zero (NRZ) conversion, Abstract; col. 7, lines 41-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-21. Tsuge is particularly compatible with the Hamlin, which includes an MPEG demux 127 and decoders 129,131 (Fig. 4) for decoding an MPEG stream; since Tsuge is also directed to decoding data included in an MPEG data stream, (NRZ modulated pixel data, which may contain closed caption data), see col. 2, lines 1-25. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Ludtke with the features of non-return to zero coding/decoding, at least for the desirable advantage of transmitting text code as NRZ modulated signals, as taught Tsuge, col. 1, lines 15-55.

8. Claims 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton, (U.S. Pat # 5,708,961), in view of Novak, (U.S. PG-PUB 2002/0104099)

Considering claim 34, the claimed client module for use in a multimedia system that includes a multimedia server that is coupled to a plurality of multimedia sources including a video network and the Internet, reads on the combination of Hylton & Novak, which comprises:

*'a network interface controller operably coupled to receive encoded channel data that represents a set of channels via a communication path from the multimedia server, the set of channels including at least one channel for providing a user with bidirectional access to the Internet, such that the NIC extracts data relating to a channel of interest from the encoded channel data'*, even though Hylton discloses that video programming may be transmitted to TIM 101, the reference does not explicitly discuss that a channel carrying Internet data may also be transmitted. However, Novak provides a teaching of a home video network wherein a plurality of multimedia sources are delivered to the STB 152, including Internet data, Para [0032-0039; 0062] & Fig. 6. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of providing a Internet channel to a customer, at least for the desirable benefit of allowing the user the convenience to accessing additional information sources, as taught by Novak.

*'video decoder to decode the data relating to the channel of interest to produce decoded data'*, is met by the operation of the video decoder 129, of Hylton, see col. 9, lines 1-25 & col. 14, lines 30-67 thru col. 15, lines 1-35; Fig. 4.

*'memory operably coupled to store the decoded video data'*, reads on the video RAM 4 of Hylton; col. 15, lines 1-15.

*'rendering module'* reads on the encoder 137, (Fig. 4; col. 16, lines 8-20).

Considering claims 35-36, see col. 14, lines 20-67, Hylton, which discloses the TV 103.

Considering claim 37, the NIC reads on the TIM 101 of Hylton, see col. 8, lines 1-45.

Considering claims 38 & 39, the claimed microphone or video camera, local to the user is met by Novak, [0061].

Novak inherently includes A/D converter for converting the inputs from camera & microphone into digital signals; see col. 15, lines 30-38.

9. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton & Novak, in view of Arai, (U.S. Pat # 7,068,677).

Considering claim 40, Hylton does not teach transmitting packets in the wireless network using CSMA technology. Nevertheless, Arai is directed to a radio LAN that uses CSMA

technology, Abstract; col. 2, lines 50-61. Arai goes on teach transmitting IP packets in the system and using the CSMA technology, see col. 5, lines 22-35. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the technique of CSMA for detecting LAN data, including IP data, as taught by Arai, for the benefit of using the known reliability of CSMA over a radio LAN system, overcoming the problem using a radio LAN over long distance, see col. 1, lines 49-67 thru col. 2, lines 1-20.

10. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton & Novak, in view of Leone.

Considering claim 41, Hylton does not discuss the claimed feature of 'Huffman decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and 'de-quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which his de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, ‘performing IDCT upon the de-Q data’ and ‘motion compensation and scaling’, see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Hazra Teaches plurality of video channels streamed over a local network.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Reuben M. Brown/  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623